



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

University of Wisconsin Library

Manuscript Theses

Unpublished theses submitted for the Master's and Doctor's degrees and deposited in the University of Wisconsin Library are open for inspection, but are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors. Bibliographical references may be noted, but passages may be copied only with the permission of the authors, and proper credit must be given in subsequent written or published work. Extensive copying or publication of the thesis in whole or in part requires also the consent of the Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin.

This thesis by.....
has been used by the following persons, whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above restrictions.

A Library which borrows this thesis for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.

NAME AND ADDRESS

DATE

Dexter Mann to Chantrel

Nov. 21 1944

*microfilm for Rev. Hugh J. Phillips
Mount St. Mary's College
Emmitsburg, Md.*

2/3/54

microfilm for Emory University Library

2/16/62

M3-M2

JOHN OF SALISBURY'S KNOWLEDGE OF THE CLASSICS

by

AUGUST CHARLES KREY

**A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of
BACHELOR OF ARTS**

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

1907

416479
JAN 12 1935
AWM
K8898

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	p. I
CHAPTER I. John of Salisbury's attitude toward the study of the classics	p. 1
CHAPTER II. John's knowledge of the classics as shown by his quotations	p. 32
CHAPTER III. Conclusion	p. 52
APPENDICES	p. 60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	p. 68

INTRODUCTION

The only safe basis for determining what classical authors John really knew, lies in the quotations, direct and indirect, which John makes from those authors. To credit him, however, with a personal knowledge of every writer whom he quotes would be even more erroneous than such a test could be today, for the man of the Middle Ages did not have our system of teaching grammar but had to rely for his training in this subject upon Donatus, Priscian, Nonius Marcellus and Servius. These grammarians treated the subject by quoting passages from classical authors in illustration of every point. When it is remembered that all instruction was in Latin and that for want of extensive libraries, grammar was very much emphasized, it will at once be apparent that very many of the quotations made by mediaeval writers could find their origin in these grammars. Priscian alone quotes over ten thousand lines from ancient authors. Though these quotations were usually of single lines, yet a skillful teacher might be able to combine them and fill in any missing words. That John had studied these works like every other mediaeval student cannot of course be doubted.

Furthermore, John had also a thorough knowledge of

the works of St. Augustine, Jerome, Isidore, Lactantius, Martianus Capella, Macrobius and Boethius. These works were an integral part of the education of every scholar of those times and John's frequent references to them show clearly that he was no exception. These writers had used the ancient authors very extensively and a man could obtain an endless fund of quotations from them alone without going to any of the authors themselves.

Mere quotation, therefore, cannot be considered as conclusive evidence that John had certain authors. If, however, he makes frequent and long quotations from such authors; if his quotations adhere more closely to the original texts than do those of intermediate sources; and if he not only quotes but shows great familiarity with the works of an ancient writer, it is usually safe to conclude that he had read the author. Furthermore, if the works in question were current in John's day; if they were used as text-books in the schools, this conclusion would be materially strengthened. Lastly, if he makes such statements as "in-legisse memini" or "noster auctor" or the work of an author is mentioned in John's will as a gift to some library, he can reasonably be credited with having had the work.

Whether or not John gets his quotation from one of

these common intermediate sources must be determined by a comparison of the passages in which such quotations occur. The accuracy of the comparisons made for this essay is unfortunately but unavoidably marred by the circumstance that the only accessible edition of John's works is Migne's¹ colossal work which was so hurriedly put together that when it is a question of close criticism of the text it is impossible to decide whether a variation is due to the editor or to John. In determining his familiarity with an author, the freeness of quotation, the general similarity in the treatment of subject matter and the comments or criticisms of the author are all to be considered.

The problem in the case of John, however, is further complicated by his great number of quotations from the classics--one thousand would be a conservative estimate--very few of which can be found in the grammars and other standard books of that time. It is necessary, therefore, to ascertain his attitude toward the study of the classics, i.e. whether or not he was the kind of man who would go to the originals for quotations. Then arises the question of whether or not it was possible at that time for him to have had access to so many classical works and lastly, on the basis of his quotations, what works he seems to have

read. The first chapter accordingly will consider his attitude toward the study of the classics.

1. Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Tomus CXCIX. Joannis, cognomine Saresberiensis, Carnotensis Episcopi, Opera Omnia. pp. 1 to 1039. Accurante J.P.Migne.

CHAPTER I

John of Salisbury's Attitude Toward the Study of the Classics

John of Salisbury, the great exponent of the classics in an age which was turning to practical studies, lived at a time when the Church was still the great, if not the sole educator of western Europe. The first Crusade had taken place, bringing with it greater prosperity and power to the Church than it had ever before enjoyed. The settlement of the investiture struggle at Worms proclaimed the practical supremacy of the Popes, while the more peaceful conditions in the West were reflected in an increasing devotion to learning. It is not surprising then that the studious activities of the age have won for it the fame of a great renaissance, the so-called Renaissance of the twelfth century. Peace, prosperity and leisure were widespread. Latin was the universal language of scholars, and the Church in practically unquestioned supremacy was in a position not only to tolerate learning but even to encourage it so long as it was not absolutely antagonistic to its teachings. The revival of the liberal, the classical studies, therefore came as a not unnatural result of existing conditions and it was amidst these

conditions that John was born and educated.

Born in the village of Salisbury in England between the years 1115-1120, he seems from the very beginning to have been gifted with an unusual amount of hard, English common-sense. The oft-told story of how he refused to be a party to the magic exhibitions of his teacher well illustrates this trait of John's character, and his later education was not of a kind to diminish it. At a comparatively early age he went to the continent to carry on his studies and Paris was his first stopping place. There at the feet of the great Abelard he spent one year, learned his Aristotle in a way that was new and bold, and it was a source of great regret to John that he could be with Abelard only a year. Notwithstanding this regret, however, John did not permit it to stand in the way of his learning the other side of the great philosophic controversy of the age. He studied with Robert of Melun and Alberic, the leaders of the Nominalist school and from William of Conches he gained what so many brilliant men of his time had failed to acquire - a knowledge of Plato, from the *Timaeus* which William had had for the first time translated. Then he went to Chartres which was at that time the center of the classical studies, and there for three

years he reviewed his grammar, not only learning but also teaching the subject under the standards of this great school. Here, too, he had the advantage of studying rhetoric from its recognized master, Bernard, the head of the school, and his praise of the subject and its teacher have been often repeated. But John was not content even with this comprehensive knowledge. His keen mind felt the need of further study. Accordingly, he went back to Paris and studied logic. Here, too, he spent two years in the pursuit of theology, the sine qua non of the mediaeval scholar. Law and medicine he also cultivated and the statement that he was the best read scholar of his age seems hardly an exaggeration.¹

Yet his education was not confined to schools and teachers. He numbered among his personal friends not only the great scholars of his time but also the great statesmen. It was upon the recommendation of Bernard of Clairvaux that he became secretary to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Theobald. In this post which he retained under Thomas a Becket, he was thrown into contact with the greatest political movements of his time. Twelve times, he relates in his *Policraticus*, he journeyed across the Alps on business for Thomas, Henry II, and his own friends. He also made journeys through France on his own

1. Schaarschmidt; Johannes Saresberiensis, pp.1-81

account. So well was he liked by Pope Adrian that that worthy made him dine at the papal table and treated him as a guest whenever he came to Rome. On one occasion, it is related, Adrian kept him there two months and only with the greatest reluctance finally consented to let him depart.¹ With Adrian's successor, Alexander III, an almost equal intimacy was enjoyed by John. Thus, acquainted with all classes of men from the highest in the Church and politics to the humble Monks and clerks, he was peculiarly well qualified to criticize the world about him. A scholar by nature, to whom leisure without letters was death in life,² he was fortunately in a position to gratify his desires to the full. The activities of the world passed, as it were, before his eyes, and that cool common-sense which had enabled him to delight in the teachings of Abelard, and yet not be carried away by them; which made him pleasing alike to Bernard and to Abelard, and which had in his boyhood repelled the magical leanings of his teacher, now served him as a guide in contemplating those activities. He saw their vanities and their weaknesses and to trace these down to their origins, to find the arguments for and against them, and to show what their results had been, with a view toward determining

1. Migne, pp. 622-626. Schaarschmidt, pp. 31-32

2. Migne, 199, 388 "quia otium sine litteris mors est, et vivi hominis sepultura."

what they would be, had long been his desire. A period of enforced idleness, due to a temporary estrangement with Henry II, gave him his opportunity and by the year 1159 while Thomas was still with the King before the walls of Toulouse, John published the *Polycraticus*, a compendium on his reflections and researches "*De Nugis Curialibus et Vestigiis Philosophorum*." This he dedicated to his friend and patron the Archbishop to whom he owed so much.

The chief importance of this work is that it is a calm critical picture of the great activities of the time, made by one who was in the midst of it all, yet sufficiently aloof to have a clear view. It depicts the great struggle in philosophy and criticizes those who pursue Aristotle to the exclusion of all else. It gives quotations from the whole *Organon* of Aristotle and represents a wider knowledge of the great Peripatetic than was general at that time, yet, it ranks Plato as the first philosopher. John repeatedly enrolls himself with the Academicians "as Augustine was and as Cicero had been in his later years." He views pathetically the progress of those who were year in, year out, engaged in inextricably winding themselves up in the labyrinth of fine spun logic without beginning or end, without a purpose in life, and he notes with pity the fact that men who were spending their whole

lives in this fruitless occupation were nevertheless consoled with the conceit of their fine distinctions and biting personalities. John himself had studied logic and his metalogicus is as effective a polemic as the writings of men who were giving their lives to dialectics. John however was too level headed to make that the object of his life. These dialecticians were opposing the study of the classics as a waste of time and it is against them that John pointed his keenest criticism.¹

During his life scholasticism was becoming more and more in vogue. Born and educated in a time when the classics were largely studied John had made them an integral part of himself. He had studied theology at the end of his early education and in his opinion excellence in theology required a thorough knowledge of the classics. To him the early Christian writing and doctrines of the Church were not the sole authority; the great danger which he feared was that the authority of the classics might prejudice the pure reason as embodied in theology and Christian ethics. This attitude ~~is~~ his training, especially at Chartres, had taught him as the most natural one and, therefore, when these scholastics, these misguided dialecticians assailed the classics as a waste of time, he looked upon their attack as the height

1. This is treated more fully on pp. 9-21.

of folly, and he fought them with all the powers of his wide learning.¹

1. Migne, pp. 658-'62. John's statement that the classics should not be detrimental to the authority of pure reason has been treated by Poole : pp. "He is speaking now of the study of the Classics, and warns us so to read them that authority do not prejudice to reason. Authority here is that of the masters of antiquity, and reason is the mental faculty considered as educated and enlightened by Christianity. The typical opposites have for the moment changed places; and the change is highly indicative of the regard in which the classics could now be held even by men the correctness of whose religious character was no less assured than was that, let us say, of the arch-enemy of learning, the champion of a 'rustic' faith, Saint Peter Damiani, a century earlier.

The classical and anti-Cornifician atmosphere of the School of Chartres is described by Cherval in his "Les Ecoles de Chartres au Moyen - Age" pp. 223-'4" Telle etait aussi la pensee de Thierry, dans son prologue de l'Eptateuchon. Dans cette assemblee des sept arts, reunie pour la culture de l'humanite, la Grammaire s'avance la premiere, comme un matrone au visage et a l'attitude severe. Elle convoque les enfants et leur inculque l'art de bien ecrire et de bien parler'; elle traduit convenablement les langues et reclame comme son bien propre l'explication de tous les auteurs: tout ce qui se dit releve de son autorite. Sa blancheur venerable lui tient pres de ses disciples d'argumentation. Jean de Salisbury a fait son metalogique pour venger l'importance des belles-lettres. En un mot, comme l'a remarque justement R. L. Poole, c'est la marque particuliere de l'ecole de Chartres: elle cultive specialement les humanites, et, dans ce but, cherche ses modeles jusque dans l'antiquite paienne."

Nor was John alone or the first in this struggle, When he was still acquiring his education this movement had already begun. The towns were beginning to become rich, France and England were thriving and wealth was becoming a commodity. The money fever was beginning to effect the schools, and students were in a hurry to get an education and go out to gather in the golden harvest. A good classical education occupied too much time. They must find a quicker method and dialectics offered itself to them as a royal road to power. With this knowledge of dialectics they could solve every problem, make the most difficult subject clear in the briefest space of time. Such were the inducements held out to prospective students by the teachers. They assailed the classics as a waste of time not justified by results and the students were lured on by these sirens of dialectics and ~~he~~ did not heed the safe haven of the classical schools. These, then, had to struggle for their very existence and they were not slow to meet the enemy. Theodoric, one of the masters of Chartres, was already in the middle of the century engaged in writing polemical essays against these enemies of the classics. These Cornificians as he called them; and John after a practical experience of eleven years together with the advantage

of broad training took up the fight where his great teacher had left it.¹

In a long but extremely significant passage John describes these "get-learning-quick" promoters. He describes not only their methods but also the character of the struggle and his own attitude toward them. "They err and they err shamefully who think that philosophy consists of mere words. They err as much, who think virtue words, as those who think that chips of wood make a grove; for the commendation of virtue lies in deeds and virtue is the inseparable companion of wisdom. Wherefore it is clear that those who cling to words alone, prefer to appear rather than be wise men. They wander around the highways, they wear away the thresholds of more learned men, propound questions and purposely confuse their words so as to convey almost any meaning, more ready to err than to examine any difficulty that may arise. Yet they fear, these debasers, not lovers, of wisdom, to show their own ignorance and that which they do not know, they prefer not to know through a perverted sense of shame, especially if there are others present to whom those things are known.

"Their arrogance is unendurable. They speak on the spur of the moment on any subject; they judge everybody;

1. Clerval, Les Ecoles de Chartres, pp.164-224.

others they find fault with, themselves them extol, boasting that they have discovered for the first time matter which was trite among the ancients and by the witness of books has been brought through many ages to our own time. Words are heaped on words so that they are often less known for weight and more for multitude than for any difficulty of subject matter. When one of them has so concealed his meaning that no one understands him he thinks that he deserves a place at the head of all philosophers and often he who knows the least propounds the most questions - questions which Pythagoras himself could not have answered. The same material he revolves over and over again, never changing, but ever winding about in the same circle. As you listen at a distance you wonder whether a third Kato has fallen from the Heavens, for whoever the man he conveys the same impression. If you inquire after his profession or his art, it is-
 'Grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes, Augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus; omnia novit! And more famous by far than the hungry Greek, he would upon request go into the very H^eavens and more wise than Daedalus he would transport you unharmed through the void whithersoever you wished.

"But should you go to find out what authors mean in

their writings; should you inquire about and discuss literature, he will assail you for your rashness and will tell you that you are more stupid than the ass of Arcadia. You are duller than lead if you ask him to explain a passage and if you insist, you are advised to flee for literature is pernicious and it is deadly in its effects. Beware lest ye be the serpent that eats up the world all the days of his life. You must be making sport or telling stories, or perhaps you are deceived.

"He who is the more verbose appears the more learned. He cares not whence or why or about what he is delivering opinions nor does he care about what anyone else propounds, so long as he is speaking. Nor does any one of these folk state for what reason he is debating, provided he can give not the true force but the mere shadow of the subject. What is true or what is false, what is probable or what is not probable, is looked for in vain, for the image of probability is prefixed to everything. State what you wish, something like it is taken up instead, for what holds in one thing, whether you will or not, they maintain holds in another that is like it. Yet it is clear that what is like the truth, is not necessarily true and what seems to be false is not always false; but if you attempt to disclose the real difference between

two propositions that seem alike, they tell you that you are speaking nonsense. They will either prevent you with their shouting or will laugh at you for doing needless work since they, say, there must be some differences between all like things but that these things ought rightly to be called not like but the same things. To teach why this is not the case is considered by them not only frivolous but truly most laughable. They tell you that they have come to hear the Peripatetic and not to listen to Hermagoras; yet they are like the Peripatetics only in their circumambulations and circumlocutions and not in any careful investigation of their subject matter.

"However, if this deception is practiced for the purpose of gaining a supply of eloquence and if in likeness unlikenesses are looked for, it is a praiseworthy practice and one for which I could not easily mention a substitute that would be more profitable for youth, provided they did not allow their faculties to be clouded by the endlessness of fallacies. Nothing is more useful, nothing is more suitable for a youth in acquiring glory and wealth than the eloquence best to be gained, where there is an abundance of material for the mind and a ready supply of words for the tongue.

"To pour forth words, on the other hand, when the

matter discussed is not understood, is pardonable in a fool, but not in a teacher or a scholar. Yet you will see many of this kind, who spend the whole live-long day in one long harangue, saying nothing at all or very little. You are tired out from listening and they unless they are too verbose, from talking; yet whither they are tending or what they are trying to say, you cannot ascertain. You think they are ending but they have just begun. If you stay to see where they are going to come out; if you try to recollect what they have woven together there will occur to you the lines -

'Velut aegri somnia, vanas

Fingentis species, ut nec pes, nec caput uni

Reddatur formae' -

You think that their brains are affected and that they cannot hold their tongues for want of the power of reason: you imagine that they have suffered continuous sleepless nights and their reason has therefore become dulled, giving rise to melancholy. If, however, you should on this account, be moved by a sense of pity for them and should urge them to moderation, they would be incensed and all the opprobriums which one man can heap upon another they would pile upon you. They rail alike at those who pity them as at those who deride them, and no one, be

he friend or foe, can escape from their vituperation. Once you have begun with them you must of necessity bear with them to the end or you will sustain the evils of their insolent tongues. Stop therefore unless you wish to be defiled by a sordid mouth: the more foul matter is disturbed the greater the stench that arises therefrom, and as you sit there and ponder, the saying of that far-sighted man inevitably occurs to your mind -

'Vesanum tetigisse timent, fugiuntque poetam

Qui sapiunt, agitant pueri, incautique sequuntur.'

"Though among those who live by themselves or lead a serious life, a man of this kind would most truly seem useless, yet amidst a crowd which delights in anything that affords material for hilarity and joyful jokes, he is very fit, for he is the best instrument for raising laughter, being more efficacious in this than a pantomime. To escape his poison you must lend patience to your ears and remain with the crazy man who spares no one and if perchance, you wish him to desist, beseech him most kindly to put more thought into his teaching and disputation, and to make up for this increase of thought by a decrease in the number of words.

"He who tempers words with knowledge and who suits his discussions to opportune occasions possesses the

the most temperate law of all eloquence and abundance of words gains praise for him alone in whom truth joins with virtue and kind words with all duties. To make many statements and make them falsely is a characteristic of a dealer in feminine fineries and of a man who has no regards for his reputation for he gains thereby only the hatred and contempt of all serious-minded men. The spirit of wisdom is authority for the statement that he who speaks sophistically is odious; nevertheless a man must understand how to pierce these importuning sophisms for without a knowledge of them he would proceed to the examination of truth and knowledge like an untried soldier who marches, unarmed, against an able and experienced enemy. It may be permissible, occasionally, for him who is acquiring training in disputation to make false statements, just as it is for a recruit to practice sportive battle among civilians. Where on the other hand, it is the intention of the disputants to enter upon a sober philosophical discussion, they lay aside all sophisms and if by chance, any do occur on either side, they are assailed by wise men just as in a state malignant treachery or trickery is coerced when it is shown in a fight between different parties.

"But the ability to temper words with knowledge,

discussion with the opportunity of time and to argue prudently any fallacies that may arise, is not to be acquired in a few days nor is it an easy task. Wherefore very many that strive after it go away again and, preferring the smallest fragment of philosophy's garb, they glory among the untaught as if everything lay within their jurisdiction, for as someone has said (his name has disappeared from the fragment which remains of him).

'Gartio quisque duas postquam scit jungere partes

Sic stat, sic loquitur velut omnes noverit artes.'

"On genera and species these men bring forth a new theory which had escaped the notice of Boethius, which the learned Plato did not know, and one which they claim by some happy lot to have, just recently, discovered in the secrets of Aristotle. They are prepared to solve the old question in the labors of which the world has already grown old; in which more time has been consumed than the house of the Caesars spent in acquiring and ruling the empire of the world, and in which more money has been squandered than Croesus had with all his riches. This has occupied the attention of many men for so long a time that they have spent their whole lives in seeking this one thing, and have discovered neither it nor anything else. Perhaps this is due to the fact that what alone

can be discovered does not satisfy their curiosity, for just as in the shadow of any body the substance of solidarity is sought for in vain so in those matters of theory which, though universally conceived of, can not be universal, the substance of existing solidarity is never found. To waste a life-time in these pursuits is an occupation for a man who has nothing to do or one who does not mind laboring in vain. These things are, indeed, like mists of fleeting clouds; the more eagerly they are sought after the more quickly they disappear. Over this question they labor in many ways and with a variety of expression; and though they use words with entire indifference as to their meaning yet somehow they manage to find various opinions and to leave abundant material for disputations to contentious men.

"Thence it is that, having selected the sensible and other singulars since these things alone are said to exist, they arrange them in a graduated order by which they fix the most general and the most special into singulars themselves. There are some who in the manner of mathematicians abstract the forms and apply to them what is said about the universals. Others discuss the perceptions (intellectus) and maintain that these are to be considered with the names of universals. There were

also some who said that words themselves were genera and species but their theory has already been exploded and it has disappeared with its author. There are still, however, those who follow in his footsteps and who though ashamed to acknowledge the author or his opinion, still cling to names alone and ascribe to speech what they have substracted from facts and theories -

Magno se iudice quisque tuetur -

and from the words of the founders who indifferently placed names for things and things for names, each constructed his own opinion or error. Thence sprang up germs for many wordy battles and everyone collected wherever he could matter to prove his heresies. From genera and species they never depart but apply them wherever speech is possible. You suddenly wonder whether you have found that poetic painter who knew how to compare a cypress to everything that necessity demanded. Thus does Rufus trifle in Naevia from which, as 'Coquus' testified, necessity averted him -

Quidquid agit Rufus, nihil est nisi Naevia Rufo

Si gaudet, si flet, si tacet, hanc loquitur.

Coenat, popinat, poscit, negat, immitit, una est

Naevia; si non sit Naevia, mutus erit.

" That subject matter appears more suitable for

philosophic discussion in which there is a freer license for manufacturing what you wish, and there is less certitude on account of the difficulty of the subject or ignorance of those who judge. Often as the cautious soldier more easily guards the rough and narrow crossways to check the enemy, so any difficult questions which they may stir up from the Scripture or from reason or anything else that is proposed they treat these with such industry that they seem mere incidents. If you cannot satisfy them that there is no one who can explain all the questions that are asked by the uneducated, they straightway wink their eyes, distort their faces, beat their breasts, shout, leap and transfigure themselves with gestures which would seem foolish in a pantomime. You cannot make yourself understood to them unless you answer them in their own words and say the things which they are accustomed to hear. Though they may be too scrupulous to speak upon the questions which you propound yet they are entirely ignorant of the solutions. In one thing however, they look out for their own interests more cautiously, for they put everything into their purses so these may be filled thereby; yet every one of them is satisfied with one little word of wisdom even though that word be hidden in a multitude of fallacies.

"I do not consider those more fitted for a philosophical discussion, however, who hang a long oration onto every little word as if a speech had to be delivered to the people upon every question that was asked of them. It is a rule if any problem is brought forth that he who answers more or less than what is asked, is ignorant of the true line of disputation. But when any one is to be taught, only those things ought to be mentioned which offer assistance to the solution. Wherefore it is clear that those who read everything in a single incident and when only one thing is sought try to explain everything, do not possess the formula for correct teaching. Either they do not know what the correct mode of teaching is or perchance they are trying to earn more money by misrepresenting their obligation and as Cicero says, they show not what the subject calls for but everything that they can.

"Therefore, those who fill the Porphyry with all the parts of philosophy, befog the minds of those who are being introduced to the study and spoil their memory, and the pupil who ought to be given an introduction they load down with so great a weight that he considers the burden which he has undertaken unbearable. I should perhaps grant that the books of the Scriptures, everyone of whose

smallest particles is full of the Divine sacrament ought to be read with great weight because the treasure of the Holy Spirit, by whose indication they were written can never be exhausted. Though the externals of the letters may be suited to one sense entirely yet within it are concealed numberless mysteries. By the same reason allegory builds up faith, while tropology builds up character in various ways. Anagogy tends, again and again, to endow literature not only with words but also with substance. In the liberal arts, however, where the meaning consists of the signification of the words he, who is not content with the sense of the words as they stand, seems to me to be either woefully mistaken or else to wish to lead his hearers from an understanding of the truth. Surely, I would consider Porphyriolus a fool if he had written so that his meaning could not be understood unless Aristotle, Plato and Plotinus were first read through. Anyone that was preparing me for any subject could introduce me with such a compendium, but I, indeed, would follow him who explained the literature and as is patent on the surface, teach me, so to speak, the historical sense."¹

1. Migne, pp. 662-666.

Such is John's description of an important phase of the scholastic movement, and the fact that modern criticism has arrived at the same conclusion - less graphically perhaps, yet the same - speaks well for John's surpassing insight. Not content with preaching their own narrow doctrines, these dialecticians assailed the classical education and, as it seems, attacked John himself. He answered them not only in their personal charges but also in behalf of the classics. This answer is embodied in the four books of the *Metalogicus*, as perfect an example of controversial essay as the best which his opponents could produce and one that illustrates well John's doctrine that logic and dialectics should be a means to an end, not an end in themselves.

In the *Metalogicus* after a liberal supply of personal abuse for his opponents, John takes up a serious defense of the classics. At the end of the first book he gives a brief account of the movement which has assailed the old system of the grammar and rhetoric schools and states his position in the matter. "It is not of the same man to serve alike letters and carnal vices! To the form of this maxim my instructors in grammar, William of Conches and Richard, surnamed the Bishop, now archdeacon in Constance, a man famed for his temperate life and teaching,

ever instructed their students. Later, however, instead of this opinion some men used this to bear prejudice to truth and men preferred to seem rather than to be philosophers and the professors of the arts began to promise that they would transmit to their hearers the whole of philosophy in a shorter time than two or three years. Overcome by the rush of the untrained multitude they gave way and as a result less time and care were devoted to the study of grammar. Thus it happens that those who profess all arts, liberal as well as mechanical, do not even know the first art, without which a person proceeds in vain to the rest. However, though the other studies make for learning, this one by a singular privilege is said to make a person liberally educated. Romulus, indeed, called this 'litteraturam' but Varro called it 'literationem' and its professor or assertor 'literator!' The ancient man, however, was called a 'literator' as that saying of Catullus shows -

'Munus dat tibi Sylla litterator'.

Whence it is probable that the despiser of grammar is not only not a grammarian (literator) but ought not even to be spoken of as a liberally educated man (litteratus).¹

1. Migne, p. 856.

Thus the struggle with the classics was a very natural result of existing conditions. The arguments used against the old education in grammar and rhetoric were that these subjects being taught from pagan sources, were detrimental to Christianity; that these subjects as taught were a waste of time; that eloquence, the object of these studies, could not be acquired, but was allotted to each individual by nature; and that wisdom, the aim of every learned man, was lessened proportionately as he studied grammar.¹

That first objection was the eternal question of the Middle Ages in regard to the study of the classics and if it were accepted it would condemn this study without appeal. But John does not accept it. That he is only too conscious of the question is plainly apparent from the constant contrast of the terms "Gentilis auctor" and "Christianus auctor" in all of his works. It was evidently a question to which he had devoted not a little thought and throughout his *Policraticus* and *Metaphisicus*, he aims to reconcile the study of the pagan authors with Christianity. The ingenuity with which he carries out this aim is remarkable. In the *Policraticus* in a chapter entitled "Omnes Scripturas esse legendas" he argues "Omnes tamen

1. Migne, pp.825-856

Scripturas legendas esse probabile est, nisi sint reprobatae lectionis, cum omnia non modo quae Scripta, sed etiam quae facta sunt ad utilitatem, licet eis abutatur interdum, instituta credantur."¹ This he proves by an interpretation of the Divine command "Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram" and then under cover of this entirely acceptable doctrine he cleverly introduces a defense of the study of the classics with the words: "Vix autem inveniatur scriptum, in quo si non in sensu vel in verbis, non reperiatur aliquid, quod prudens lector emittit. Caeterum libri catholici tutius leguntur et cautius; et gentiles simplicioribus periculoribus patent; sed in utrisque exerceri fidelioribus ingeniis utilissimum est."²

There is objectionable matter in all writings, even the Scriptures, but that is no reason for condemning them entirely. The prudent reader can gather much that is useful from them. If you find anything at variance with the Christian faith, lay it to the customs of the age in which the writer lived and do not cast him aside on that account. Such in brief is the attitude of John and he carries out this attitude in practice. He reads the authors himself but in quoting them he strives to use

1. Migne, p. 658.

2. Migne, p. 659.

only those passages wherein very little pagan theology is contained. If, however, he must use a passage that is too full of pagan sentiment he translates the passage with expurgatorial freedom,¹ or uses some Christian writer on the subject.²

This is John's own private opinion in favor of this study. In his *Metalogicus*, under stress of battle, he does not even conceive the possibility of grammar coming into conflict with Christianity. It is the Cornificians who are contravening the true teaching for they are opposing eloquence by which alone man is able to make use of that power of reason which God has given to man in distinction from beasts. By doing away with eloquence they are ever widening the gulf between man and God for man is then as low as the beasts.³

 1. This is well illustrated in his use of Plutarch:-
"Nam, deducta superstitione, gentilium fidelis est in sententiis, in verbis luculentus et in sacrario morum tantus arbiter, ut facile praeceptorem Trajani possis agnoscere. Si quid autem apud eum a fide dissentit, aut moribus tempori potius, quam viro ascribatur." p. 539.
 Another example is:- *"Eam usquequaque nititur evacuare Plutarchus et ex praemissis quattuor locis, naturae, officii, morum, conditionis, totius reverentiae manare credit originem. Superstitionis tamen hoc infidelium more exsequitur. Unde nonnullas sententias ejus, sensu et sermone catholico curavi inserere."*

2. It is for this reason John says that he takes his quotations on the Roman Emperors from Orosius instead of from the great pagan accounts, though they give fuller descriptions. p. 788.

3. Migne, p. 824-7.

Firmly entrenched behind this bold assertion of right he proceeds to overthrow the other objections. He refutes the fatalistic doctrine that eloquence is a gift of nature, not to be acquired by cultivation by citing two classic examples, Socrates and Rufus Scaurus who overcame the obstacles of nature by earnest endeavor.¹ Though nature may endow one person with more ability than another, yet without training that gift is naught and this training can only be truly obtained in the old-style grammar schools. Their practical value lies in the fact that they alone can give the student a complete mastery of the art of writing and reading both poetry and prose. The ability to use figures of speech, understand the structure of a sentence and master the mechanics of composition are to be acquired nowhere else, and yet, these are not the only benefits to be derived from a study of the classics.² Men must study to become poets and it is still a celebrated fact that poetry is the cradle of philosophy. This training, however, does more than make poets: "Disciplinas liberales tantae utilitatis esse tradit antiquitas, ut quicumque eas plene norint libros omnes, et quaecunque Scripta sunt, possunt intelligere

1. Migne, p. 836.

2. Migne, p. 836-838.

etiam sine doctore"-¹ it places a man in a position to understand whatever has been written, without the need of a teacher. The contention that a "grammaticus" confines himself to his books, stories or poems, is far from the truth; the real aim of the classics is to seek and transmit "informationem virtutis quae facit virum bonum"² and that this is John's aim is constantly impressed on his readers by the way in which he uses his quotations especially in history. He chooses those passages which offer an example or lesson that will be of moral service to his own time.

After all, however, results afford the best criterion by which to judge any question. What these opponents of the classics have accomplished by their new method of instruction is expressed in the words: "Alii monachorum aut clericorum claustrum ingressi sunt. Alii, autem, suum in philosophia intuentes defectum, Salernum vel ad Montepessulam profecti, facti sunt clientuli medicorum et repente quales philosophi, tales in momento medici eruperunt."³ and "Nihil stultum, nisi paupertatis angustias et solas opes ducunt esse fructum sapientiae."⁴

1. Migne, p. 852.

2. Ibid

3. Ibid, p. 830.

4. Ibid, p, 831.

Led by sordid motives these men led equally sordid lives for their education gave them no higher aim in life than the accumulation of money. In a passage whose effect would be greatly lost by translation, he contrasts with this the man trained in the classics. This man has been taught to seek out and spread the knowledge of virtue, for - *Caeterum operationem cultumque virtutis, scientia naturaliter paecedit; neque enim virtus currit in incertum aut in pugna, quam exercet cum vitiis aerem verberat,*

'Sed videt quo tendit, et in quod dirigit arcum:

Nec passim corvos sequitur testaque lutoque.'

At lectio, doctrina, et meditatio scientiam pariunt. Unde constat quod grammatica, quae istorum fundamentum est et radix, quodammodo sementem jacet quasi in sulcis naturae, gratia tamen praeunte; quae, si ei cooperatrix quoque gratia adfuerit, in solidae virtutis robur coalescit et crescit multipliciter, ut boni operis fructum faciat, unde boni viri et nominantur, et sunt. Sola tamen gratia, quae at velle bonum et perficere operatur, virum bonum facit et prae caeteris omnibus recte scribendi et recte loquendi, quibus datum est, facultatem impertitur, artesque ministrat varias et cum se indigentibus benique offert, contemni non debet. Si enim contemnitur, juste recedit, nec contemptori relinquitur conquestionis locus.¹

1. Migne, p. 853.

In this passage John has summed up his arguments for the study of the classics. He has shown how this study works hand in hand with the Divine Grace in making a man good, and thereby has left his opponents no ground on which to base any contention. Continuing in this strain he repeats his motto: "est enim ejusdem hominis, litteris et carnalibus vitiis inservire" a motto which would do honor to any humanist of later ages and he ends his defense of the subject with a quotation from Quintilian on the praise of grammar. "Haec est igitur liberalium artium prima, necessaria pueris, jucunda senibus, dulcis secretorum comes; et quae sola, in omni studiorum genere, plus habet operis, quam ostentationis."¹

Such is the attitude of John of Salisbury toward the study of the classics. They should not be an end in themselves but "ad haec non modo pedum aut temporum ibi ratio habenda est, sed aetatum, locorum, temporum, aliorum - que, quae sigillatim referre ad praesentem attinet; cum omnia a naturae officina proveniant." To study the past for the purpose of understanding and guiding the present became well that cool, critical, contemplative mind, and the lines at the opening of the Policraticus "Me curialibus nugis paulisper ademi, illus volvens in animo,

1. Migne, p. 856.

quia otium sine litteris mors est, et vivi hominis sepultura", show that John loved his letters as well, and probably quite as sincerely, as the humanists of the later Renaissance. It will be the aim of the remainder of this paper to show that John had not only an opportunity to satisfy his desire and love for the classics but that he also took advantage of this opportunity.

CHAPTER II.

John's Knowledge of the Classical
Authors as Shown by his Quotations.

That there was a classical revival in the twelfth century has become a generally recognized fact but to what extent the scholars of that time were acquainted with the originals is not so well known. Sandys has traced the survival of certain authors in special localities and in his enumeration of extant manuscripts the significant fact appears that an unusual number of them were copied in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries¹. The general use of classical writers at this time is shown by several contemporary documents which describe the curricula of the schools. The most noteworthy is the so-called *Dictionarius* of Jean de Garland which is a work of the later twelfth and not of the thirteenth century². The manuscript gives an exposition of the subjects and authors which are studied in the schools, prescribing the parts of a work which ought

1. A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth century B.C. See also Teuffel and Schwabe, and Norden "Die Antike Kunstprosa."

2. Through the kindness of Dr. L. H. Paetow of Wisconsin, who has possession of a copy of this manuscript, the writer is enabled to present these facts.

and ought not to be read.¹ The great list of classical authors is certainly surprising but the work shows in addition that whole and not merely parts of them were used. The Heptateuchon of Theodore² of Chartres is a similar document which treats particularly of the curriculum of Chartres and it serves materially to confirm the general prevalence of classical studies. The will of John³ of Salisbury himself enumerates a partial list of the books which he left to the library at Chartres and it contains a number of ancient works. In view of this general survival of the classics; in view of John's character, his travels, his friends, and his humanistic leanings, one would naturally expect to find in him an extensive knowledge of the classics.

Of the authors whom John quotes, Virgil is, of course, the foremost, as he was with preceding writers. To John, Virgil is the world philosopher--"procedat tibi poeta Mantuanus, qui, sub imagine fabularum, totius philosophiae exprimit veritatem"⁴ and the Aeneid the book of life--"Virgilius

1. Among the classical authors mentioned are Statius, Virgil, Juvenal, Horace, Ovid, Sallust, Cicero, Martial, Petronius, Symmachus, Suetonius, Livy and Seneca.

2. Clerval: Les Ecoles de Chartres au Moyen Age pp. 220-248.

3. Migne, Intro. p. XII.

4. Migne, p. 621.

in libro quo totius philosophiae rimatur arcana.¹ The conception of the Aeneid as held by the school of Chartres, John enlarges with great detail. The first book with its story of the ship wreck² symbolizes the trials of strong child-hood; the second book illustrates the development and frank curiosity of boyhood; the third the errors of youth; the fourth pictures illicit love; the fifth shows manhood, fully developed, beginning to verge toward old age, while in the sixth old age with failing powers is awaiting impending death. This does not mean, however, that John knew only the first six books of the Aeneid. On the contrary some of his longest quotations are taken from the later books.

The Georgics and Eclogues are equally well known to him. In the first especially he finds many lessons for his own generation, and a very notable instance of this is the passage wherein he quotes sixty-seven lines from the fourth Georgic, introducing the quotation with the words "Poetarum doctissimus Maro ut civilem vitam ab apibus mutuatur"³ and concluding with the comment "Republicae omnes auctores percurrere, rerum publicarum revolve historias, vita civilis tibi rectius et elegantius nusquam

1. Migne, p. 430.

2. Ibid, pp. 620-'2.

3. Ibid pp. 619-'20.

occuret. Essentque procul dubio beatae civitates, si hanc sibi vivendi praescriberent formam."¹ Such lessons he draws too from the Eclogues, and he ranks the wisdom of the rural shepherd as far superior to that of the men of his own time - "Unde apud Virgilium compos sui pastor, et sapientibus et viris nostri temporis doctior, ait" adding a quotation from the Eclogues. These are but instances of the constant use which he makes of these works. The whole Polycraticus fairly teems with Virgilian allusions and expressions.²

Next to Virgil, Lucan occupies the second place in the affections of John for the Ancient epics. This writer, whose Pharsalia Otto of Freising is said to have carried as a diversion on his journey to Rome, was a general favorite with the scholars of the twelfth century. The Pharsalia, John relates, was used along with the Aeneid as a text book full of ethical teachings, but he does not rank Lucan with Virgil.³ On the contrary, he accepts Quintilian's estimate of him "Immit enim poeta doctissimus; si tamen poeta dicendus est, qui vera narratione rerum ad historicos magis accedit...." and calls him "poeta gravissimus" and "mathematicus"⁴ but his many and long quotations from this

-
1. Migne, p. 620.
 2. See Appendix A.
 3. Migne, p. 854.
 4. Ibid, p. 441.

work show that he appreciated it none the less.¹

Statius, the other favorite epic of the time is not so great a favorite with John for he quotes this poet only ten times. These quotations, however, are taken from all the books of the *Thebais* and as but few of them can be found in the mediaeval text-books it would seem that the *Thebes*, at least, was not entirely unknown by John. His familiar use of titles like "apud Statium," "Papinius" and "Photinus", in introducing quotations from this source indicates that he knew Statius quite well.²

That other much discussed poet, Ovid, who so greatly shocked some of the more orthodox and aged scholars of the Middle Ages, was treated by John as an ethical teacher. With the ultra-fastidious condemnation of this writer John is not at all in sympathy. There is undoubtedly much in Ovid that is to be condemned, he says, but there is also much that is good and for that reason Ovid ought to be read by the educated.³ John's quotations from Ovid are taken from all of the better known works of the poet. Though those from the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* are longer and more numerous, the *Ars Amatoria*, *Remedia Amoris*,

1. See Appendix B.

2. Ennius and Accius, however, who are also quoted, were probably not known to John for the quotations from both of these can be traced back directly to other sources. See Appendix C.

3. Migne, pp. 714-'5.

Tristia, Heroides, Amores and the Epistulae ex Ponto are by no means neglected. The line from the Amores "Nitimur in vetitum semper"- is an especial favorite. Although John made use of Ovid as a moralist, he was not blind to his immorality. He condemns Ovid as the poet who filled not only the City but the whole world with his lascivious amours and taught the bashful and troubled suitor how to approach his maiden.¹ He also characterizes Ovid as the poet who excelled² all others in "levitatem versificandi."³ John's criticism of Ovid was very modern.

There are poets, however, who are thought of as essentially moralists. Of these, that great favorite, Horace, deserves first attention. For him John has great respect: "Consonat ei, si Lyricum conticenti lyra dignaris audire, Flaccus, aut si mavis, Horatius."⁴ He speaks of Horace as the poet who excelled in the varieties of metres but his usual title is "Ethicus."⁵ The Epistles, especially the Ars Poetica, are most frequently quoted though John's familiarity with the Satires is equally extensive. In several places he has adapted whole satires, as for instance in his description of the feast of "Nasidienus."⁶ John's

-
1. Migne, p. 498.
 2. Ibid, p. 484.
 3. See Appendix D.
 4. Ibid, p. 656.
 5. Ibid, p. 484.
 6. Ibid, pp. 736-'8.

description of Horace as the lyrical poet has led Manitius to credit him with a knowledge of the Odes also. True, in one or two places John seems to echo them, as in his use of "atavis editus" and "dulce est desipere in loco." Furthermore, the Odes were known in John's day in northern France but it would seem that John probably would have quoted them more often had he really known them at first hand. These expressions, as Schaarschmidt has pointed out, had probably become familiar quotations and they are entirely insufficient to serve as a basis for a definite assertion of John's familiarity with the Odes.¹

Under the title "Ethici" Juvenal and Persius are also quoted. They were special favorites with John. He takes more than eighty direct quotations from them. He confesses his weakness for them in several places but it is significant that he does not distinguish between the two.² Nowhere does he mention Persius by name, nor does he designate him by any distinctive title though his possession of both of them is quite certain. This peculiarity may be explained by the theory that two satirists were then published, as they are now, in the same edition, and that the name of the second may have been lost.³ From the frequency and accuracy of his quotations, however, it seems certain that John not only read the works of these

1. See Appendix E.

2. Migne, p. 596 et passim.

writers but had them before him as he wrote.¹

Another satirist of the Roman world, whom John uses extensively is Petronius. The satires, like those of the writers just mentioned, are culled from freely and in one place he has copied word for word the whole story of the woman of Ephesus which covers two of the large pages in Migne's text. The accuracy of this quotation coupled with the fact that the work was in general use can scarcely leave doubt as to his possession of the work. With respect to the *Cena Trimalchionis*,² which he also cites, there is not so much certainty. This work was very rare, the only manuscript of that time now extant having been discovered in Dalmatia. Still, the relative accuracy of his citations is such that there can be no doubt as to their source. He had probably read the work on one of his journeys and remembered it vividly enough to cite from it, for he could not have obtained his material in such shape from any intermediate source.

Martial's *Epigrammata* must be considered with the works of the Satirists as one of the sources upon which John drew in his criticism of existing vanities. This writer whom for some reason he has nick-named "Coquus"

1. See Appendix F.

2. See Appendix G.

frequently thinks as John thinks "Sic Martialis, sic et ego; malens sic nugari quam ad formam Ganymedis leporis agitare"¹- and though the quotations are comparatively few, they are exceedingly precious, since in only one of the nineteen lines quoted is there any distinct variation from the text.²

On the other hand, Terence is the only play-writer of antiquity with whom John exhibits any marked familiarity. In the "Eunuch" he delights especially because of its commentary on life - "Comici forte contemnis Eunuchum sed in Eunucho fere omnium vitam expressit."³ Its happy touches on the follies of mankind meet with John's heart-felt approval: "Jucundus est enim comicus, et aptus qui se nugis nostris frequenter inmiscet."⁴ The Andria, too, is drawn upon for its lessons: "Quae vero ad gratiam sine invidia via expeditissima sit, senex docet in Andria, dum filium omnibus obsequi, neminem laedere refert."⁵ The "Adelphi" is quoted only once, and as no other allusion is made to it and as this quotation can be traced to other sources, it is probable that John had not read the work. John's mention of "miles gloriosus" cannot be construed as

-
1. Migne, p. 825.
 2. See Appendix.H.
 3. Migne, p. 711.
 4. Ibid, p. 482.
 5. Ibid, p. 705.

a mention of the play of Plautus by that name.¹

There are several renowned writers of ancient times not generally known in John's day whom John quotes. These are Cato, Plautus, Varro and Catullus. The quotations from Cato and Varro can all be traced to other mediaeval sources. With Plautus it is the same, for although the characters "Mandrogerus", "Querolus" and "Sycophans" are used constantly in the Policraticus, this does not prove that he had read the plays. These characters were used as types by Christian writers from the days of Augustine. Furthermore there are no direct quotations from the plays. It is, then, safe to say that he had not read them. There is only one quotation from Catullus and that is evidently taken from Martianus Capella. With none of these writers does he exhibit any direct familiarity.²

Of the prose writers, Cicero, Quintilian and Seneca are used most frequently. That oft-quoted passage from the Entheticus "Orbis nil habuit maius Cicerone Latino" shows in what great esteem John held this writer. Cicero is constantly quoted in almost every work of John's and is ranked with the great fathers of the Church as the soundest authority on any subject he touches. To be "as Augustine

1. See Appendix I.

2. See Appendix J.

was and as Cicero had been in his later years - an Academician"¹ was his boast, and his similarity to this great writer is not confined to philosophy alone. So pure is his style and so much nearer to Cicero's than that of any of his contemporaries that the German scholars have justly considered it as modelled upon Cicero. A close inspection of John's writings reveals his wide knowledge of this author, who excels all others in "copiam dicendi." The so-called Ciceronian work "Ad Herrenium," the "de Partitione Oratoria" and the "de Inventione Rhetorica" were, of course, text-books at Chartres and had been known to John as such. He owned copies of the "De Officiis" and the "De Oratore," and bequeathed them to the library at Chartres. It is therefore perfectly natural that he should quote from these very frequently. In his letters especially, but in all his works he cites the "ad Familiares," and the frequency and accuracy of his quotations show that he probably obtained them directly from the original, which was well known at the time. The Tusculan Disputations and the New Academy are, of course, the works upon which he bases his statement that Cicero was an Academician in his latter years.¹ These works are constantly cited upon philosophical questions, and the extent of

1. Migne, p. 388 et passim.

the familiarity seems to demonstrate the use of the originals. The same charm which the "De Amicitia" has for modern readers attracted John. John uses Laelius and Scipio for their views on friendship as devoutly as the most enthusiastic freshman. With the "Orator" and the "de Natura Deorum" also he appears quite familiar. Both works were well known in the Middle Ages, especially the latter, which was used by St. Augustine in the interpretation of the Scriptures. John's quotations from them are, however, very few. The "De Senectute" is alluded to once or twice but in a way that suggests that the quotations from this work were obtained from other sources. The "De Fato," the "Paradoxa Stoicorum" and the "de Divinatione" were quite well known in John's day, but he uses them in such a vague way that it is impossible to give him credit for them for want of evidence. Schaarschmidt has ascribed a knowledge of all of these works to him but as John only mentions them a single time and then only in an indirect manner such a statement cannot be justified. Of course it may well be that John does not quote everything which he has read, just as he may not know at first hand every work from which he quotes. Still John's allusions to these works could have been made from any number of other sources,¹ and his references to them do not enable the

1. See Appendix K.

writer to credit him with a knowledge of the works themselves.

His familiarity with Quintilian is more certain than with some of Cicero's works. At the end of a letter to an obscure monk named Azo he expressly says, "Mihi autem nihil precor nisi ut Quintilianum quem petii scriptum et emendatum mittas"¹ and that he here refers to the "Institutiones Oratoriae" his numerous long quotations bear ample witness. John's educational system, as described in the *Metalogicus*, is based almost entirely upon Quintilian. He supports almost every point which he makes with a quotation from this writer. As against the Cornificians' use of Seneca as an authority against the liberal arts John cites Quintilian's description of Seneca. His final statement of the value of grammar is made in the words of Quintilian. These are but instances of his vital intimacy with the *Institutions*. The "Declamationes" are cited but not so conclusively. Still, since they were well known at Chartres and through France and England, it is probable that he had read them, though the quotations themselves would not establish this.²

With the works of Seneca he seems to have been

1. Migne, p. 313.
2. See Appendix L.

thoroughly conversant. He knew that there were two great Senecas and he makes it clear that it is the Younger from whom he quotes: "Unde illud apud Senecam (alienum tandem)"¹. Aristotle was explained to the beginner at that time by the interpretation of Seneca's "de Clementia" and "de Beneficiis," and that John was once such a beginner is shown by his quotations from these works.² The "de Ira" and the Dialogues are also frequently drawn upon while the "Quaestiones Naturales" and the Letters are thoroughly ransacked. There is no allusion to the Tragedies. In the list of the works of Seneca which John says ought to be read, all those mentioned occur, with the strange exception of the Tragedies. He owned a copy of the "Quaestiones Naturales" and constantly quotes from it, especially in the Metalogicus. He was so familiar with Seneca that when the Cornificians cited him in support of the futility of the liberal education John was not only able to show that Seneca was not opposed to the study of grammar but that he was a writer who ought to be studied as well as for his style as for his great moral teachings. John found his own language inadequate to express his appreciation of Seneca and drew upon Quintilian. He regarded Seneca as almost Christian in sentiment:³ "Rationi

1. Migne, p. 875.

2. Sandys, p.

3. Migne, p. 925.

Hebraeorum consentit Senecae definitio, etsi ille aliud senserit."¹

The great historians of antiquity do not occupy so high a place in his regard. The passage in which he quotes Orosius in preference to the greater writers because they are too pagan, has already been cited.² and in this John was quite consistent with himself and his age. In his eyes the great value of antiquity lay in the moral examples and teachings which it afforded. He did not quote passages merely for the sake of quoting them. They must be brief and pointed and long descriptions of men and events filled with pagan thought were of little use for his purposes. To be sure, he read some of them. For an educated man there was much of value in these histories but it would not be proper to quote long passages from them in a work that was to be extensively read. Accordingly only short, significant sentences are used in direct quotation, though several stories are gleaned from them. These are related in John's own words, as a rule, though statements of the source frequently appear.³

There are very many passages from Suetonius, especially from his poetry and there are four from Sallust. Two of the latter can be traced to other sources but one from the

-
1. See Appendix M.
 2. See above, p.
 3. Migne, p.

Jugurtha and one from the Catiline cannot be accounted for except on the assumption of John's knowledge of the texts. As these were current at the time and as John seems to be quite familiar with Sallust,¹ it is probable that he knew both of these works. The third Decade of Livy which was often used in this time, seems also to have been known by John and though he quotes Julius Florus directly, on the Punic wars yet his familiarity with the subject, his reference to Livy, as "scriptor belli Punici Titus Livius refert,"² and his use of material which could only have been obtained from the original, make it altogether probable that he had read at least a part of Livy.

John speaks also of Tacitus and Quintus Curtius as historians who give full descriptions of certain events, but his own works give no hint that he knew more than the names of these two. Naturally, he is more familiar with the epitomists and anecdotic historians. His use of these writers is aptly described by Schaarschmidt: "diese Autoren werden formlich geplündert."³ It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that if the fourth book of the Strategemata of Frontinus or the fourth book of the Facta et Dicta Memorabilia were lost they could be restored

1. Migne, p. 500. "Crispo historicorum inter Latinos potissimo."

2. Migne, p. 495.

3. Schaarschmidt, p. 90.

from the Polycraticus. His quotations from them are not confined to these two books. The De Re Militari of Vegetius and the Epitoma of Justin are used almost as extensively. Julius Florus is quoted only twice but both passages are fairly long and quite accurate, so that he probably had the work.¹

John apparently read the natural histories of the Elder Pliny which were so commonly used at that time in Northern France as an encyclopaedia. He says: "memor hominum, quos in libro Naturalis Historiae apud Plinium didici"² and the quotation which follows this could hardly have been taken except from the original.³

Aulus Gellius is the source of many quotations and the "Atticae Noctes" is often mentioned. John had evidently read the work since he states "In Atticis Noctibus legisse memini"⁴ and the length and accuracy of his quotations quite corroborate this statement.⁵

Three writers whom John quotes in but a single passage are Publilius Syrus, Serenus Sammonicus, and Solinus. His quotations, however, are so long and accurate that he could hardly have obtained them from mediaeval sources and it is reasonable to conclude that he had used the

-
1. See Appendix N.
 2. Migne, p. 576
 3. See Appendix O.
 4. Migne, p. 525.
 5. See Appendix P.

works in whole or in part. It is true that they were not very generally known and that he mentions Publilius Syrus calling him Publilius Clodius. On the other hand, the appreciative description seems to show that he was acquainted with this author. Five lines are quoted from the medical verses of Serenus Sammonicus and as this writer was coming into use about this time John probably obtained the quotation from the original. The same holds true of Solinus.¹

Of the later Latin writers Appolinarius Sidonius, Dionysius Cato, Apuleius, Avienus, Macrobius and Claudianus can be credited to John without hesitation.²

Eutropius is not so certain. Of the four quotations from this writer in the Polycraticus, two can be traced directly to other sources while the others are too short to afford convincing evidence that John had the work.

Schaarschmidt has attempted to prove that John was familiar with this writer by saying that he quotes him once without mentioning his name, but the passage in question is a word for word quotation from Orosius. On the other hand, John possessed this work before his death since he bequeathed it to Chartres.³ Schaarschmidt may, therefore, be correct, even though the evidence he adduces is bad.⁴

1. See Appendix Q.
2. Schaarschmidt, p.
3. Migne, Introduction p. xii.
4. See Appendix R.

Whether or not John had Pliny the Younger brings up the question of the lost authors that John knew. He mentions Pliny several times as though he knew his works but he nowhere quotes him directly. In one place he quotes a passage giving "Caecilius Balbus" as the authority. Wölfflin, a German philologist, took this quotation and other quotations in the work of John and mediaeval writers which could not be traced to any known Roman sources and placed them in book form, ascribing the whole to this Caecilius Balbus. Then Reifferscheid, another German scholar, showed that this particular quotation from Caecilius Balbus was taken from two passages in the Panegyric of Pliny the Younger and that Caecilius Balbus was a nickname for Caecilius Plinius. The loose character of the quotation he used as an illustration of John's free use of his sources, and this opinion has been accepted by Schaarschmidt and Manitius who relying upon Reifferscheid, accordingly assert that John had Pliny. If Reifferscheid is correct, it must be said that this is probably the freest quotation which John ever makes. The other unassignable quotations of John, are almost all of them anecdotes of the great men of antiquity. Reifferscheid ascribes these to the "De Vestigiis Philosophorum" of Flavianus which is mentioned by John, asserting that this is none other than the Virius Nicomachus Flavianus who is

employed as an interlocutor by Macrobius. This work Reifferscheid says, must have been seen by John in original manuscript form in Paris, the manuscript being subsequently lost. This is rather an easy way out of the difficulty. Schaarschmidt believes that this Flavianus was a compiler of anecdotes from Greek sources. Be that as it may, there are in John's works many quotations giving anecdotes about the great Ancients which can be traced to no known author of Roman times, although all of them can be found in the works of such Greeks as Diogenes Laertius.¹

The question of John's knowledge of Greek which is here involved is a much debated one. He frequently uses Greek words; explains the etymology of Latin words by them and describes their significance, but Schaarschmidt asserts that all these can be traced to Boethius and other Latin sources. Then too, John refers to and quotes such writers as Xenophon, Herodotus, Demosthenes, Homer, and Aristophanes. All these can be found in other sources. But John also gives a copy of a letter of Plutarch to the Emperor Trajan, and makes many statements on the authority of this writer. He uses Josephus on the fall of Jerusalem and quotes Hegesippus frequently. These two, Schaarschmidt says were taken from Eusebius's "Historia Ecclesiastica" but this letter of Plutarch's can be explained

1. See Appendix S.

in many other ways - all on the assumption that John knew no Greek. The whole question must be considered as still open.¹

1. John has been considered as the first of the mediaeval authors to use the entire Organon of Aristotle and one of the first to use the "Timaeus" of Plato. The last work was translated at the instigation of John's teacher, William of Conches.¹ Many of the scholars of the time had a little smattering of Greek from the intercourse of the German court with the East.² William is credited with a considerable knowledge of this language.³ John had John the Saracen translate Greek works for him. John himself used Greek words, quoted from Greek authors and corrected the Saracen's translation of Dionysius. It would seem strange if John himself did not know some 4 Greek under such circumstances. Clerval thinks he did.

1. Poole, pp. 124-130.
2. Carl Huth: Thesis 1904.
3. Migne, pp. 161-13.
4. Clerval, p. 232.

CONCLUSION

Was John of Salisbury a humanist? Can he be considered a precursor of the later Renaissance? Schaarschmidt holds that he can be so considered. Voigt, on the other hand, claims that John did not have that "feeling for the Greek"; "that desire to live over again the ancient days"- and therefore was not truly imbued with the humanistic spirit. Before passing a final judgment, however, the circumstances under which he wrote ought to be noted.

His three great works, the Policraticus, Entheticus and Metalogicus were all finished about the same time - 1159. He was not master of a school, nor a librarian. His school days had ended eleven years before and, ever since, he had been engaged in looking after the confidential affairs of his superiors. The composition of these works, therefore, was entirely the occupation of his leisure moments. His temporary estrangement with Henry gave him an unusual amount of time so that he was able not only to finish his Policraticus and Entheticus, upon which he had been working for some time, but also to write the Metalogicus in answer to the opponents of the classics.

It is, perhaps, unfortunate that John did not sing his own praises, that he did not proclaim himself as the only and original exponent of the true appreciation of the

classics. In his early training at Chartres there had been impressed upon him the maxim that indulgence in vices could not exist where the love for letters held sway. He states, himself, that this love for letters meant more especially love for the classical works. Therefore when he took up his pen against the Cornificians, it was not to preach a new doctrine, but to defend a principle which had become thoroughly ingrained in his very system.

That "feeling for the Greek" is a rather vague term. John appreciated the fact that Greek philosophers were the source of all philosophy. It was on this account that he had John the Saracen translating Greek philosophy for him. He loved Virgil and considered the Aeneid the book of life but he did not forget to state that the ideas of this work were but an adaptation of a greater poet, Homer. If the feeling for Greek means an abandonment to pure aesthetic interests, then John was not guilty.

John was an Englishman and a practical man. In him the purely aesthetic was distinctly subordinated to the ethical. The classics were primarily of use for the "informationem veritatis et virtutis". They must serve some useful end for his own time, but in using them he proceeded far ahead of his own time. He saw that even the Scriptures could be clarified by an appeal to antecedent

philosophy and life, and he used them for this purpose as much as he did the writings of the Fathers. The truth must be found at the source of things, and it was to the sources that he was going when he had the Greek philosophers translated for him.

There was another side to his love for the classics. His "otium sine litteris mors est" is indeed a revelation. How much appreciation - true appreciation - does this imply? That he appreciated style in a writer, his comment on the writing of Bernard of Chartres and his own pure style bear witness. But did he find enjoyment in the study of the classics? This question can only be answered by another - why did he so strenuously advocate them as an occupation for leisure? Why "non ejusdem hominis est carnalibus vitiis et litteris inservire" and why does he urge the people to a study of the classic letters?

Petrarch the great and first humanist, was content, according to tradition, to die with a copy of Homer, of which he understood hardly a word, at his head. If John had had a copy of Homer, he would have had it well translated and let the beautiful teachings of this work become general. His interests were primarily philosophical and his most busy moments were none too busy for him to devote a little time to searching into the truths of philosophy. What an interesting picture which that letter of his to John the

Saracen presents! It is the fourth year of his exile, the third of his banishment from England, yet amid all the harrowing negotiations with Thomas a Becket with the Pope and the Lords of Europe, he finds time to look over and correct the translation of Dionysius which the Saracen had sent to him and he asks him to finish it so that he can enjoy the full teachings of the work. Such was John's appreciation.

He lived in a time which was none too favorable to the classics; when the narrow religious bigotry was not yet dispelled as it is today, nor as it was a century and a half later in Italy. He was trying to reconcile the study of the classics with the teachings of religion - to make them serve a useful purpose in furthering those teachings just as today there is a movement to reconcile the discoveries of science with religion - to bring them to the support of Christianity. A final judgment, then, of John's humanism must taken into consideration such an attitude towards the study of the classics, so wide a knowledge of the authors of antiquity by a man who was primarily engaged in practical affairs - in the light of the age in which he lived as compared with that of the "true humanism" of Italy in the fifteenth century and in Northern Europe in the sixteenth century.

A tabular statement of John's classical knowledge will serve to summarize these conclusions:

I. The classical writings which, according to the evidence presented, can be credited to John's knowledge.

AULUS GELLIUS -- Noctes Atticae.

CICERO -- Ad Herennium, De Partitione Oratoria,
De Inventione Rhetorica, De Oratore, De
Officiis, Tusculani Disputationes, Nova
Academica, Ad Familiares, De Amicitia.

FRONTINUS -- Strategematica.

HORATIUS -- Sermones et Epistulae.

JUVENAL -- Satyrae.

LUCANUS -- Pharsalia.

MARTIAL -- Epigrammata.

OVIDIUS -- Metamorphoses, Fasti, Amores, Ars Amatoria,
Remedia Amoris, Epistulae ex-Ponto.

PERSIUS -- Satyrae.

PETRONIUS -- Satyrae, Cena Trimalchionis.

PLINIUS -- Historiae Naturales.

QUINTILIANUS -- Institutiones Oratoriae.

SALLUSTIUS -- Catilina and Jugurtha.

SENECA -- De Clementia, De Beneficiis, Quaestiones
Naturales, Epistulae et Dialogi.

STATIUS -- Thebais.

SUETONIUS -- Caesares.

^L
 PUBILIUS SYRUS -- -----
 TERENCE -- Eunuchus et Andria.
 VALERIUS MAXIMUS -- Memorabilia.
 VIRGIL -- Aeneid, Georgics, Eclogues.

II. Classical writings which John quotes and which cannot be credited to his knowledge for want of sufficient evidence.

ACCIUS -- -----
 CATO -- -----
 CATULLUS -- -----
 CICERO -- De Fato, De Divinatione, De Senectute,
 De Natura Deorum, Orator, Orationes, Paradoxa
 Stoicorum.
 CURTIUS -- -----
 ENNIUS -- -----
 HORATIUS -- Carmina.
 OVIDIUS -- Tristia, Heroides.
 PLAUTUS -- Miles Gloriosus.
 CAECILIUS PLINIUS -- Epistulae et Panegyricus.
 SALLUSTIUS -- Historiae.
 TACITUS -- -----
 TERENCE -- Adelphi.
 VARRO -- -----
 LIVIUS -- -----

III. Later Latin writers who can be ascribed to John's knowledge.

APOLLINARIS SIDONIUS

APULEIUS S

CLAUDIANUS

DONATUS

DIONYSIUS CATO

EUTROPIUS

JUSTINUS

JULIUS FLORUS

MACROBIUS

MARTIANUS CAPELLA

NONIUS MARCELLUS

PRISCIAN

SERENUS SAMMONICUS

SERVIUS

SOLINUS

VEGETIUS



APPENDICES

A

John's interpretation of Vergil's *Aeneid* is treated more fully by Comparetti in his "*Vergil in the Middle Ages*," p. 117. (ed. of 1895)

There are over 80 direct quotations from Virgil; at least 42 from the *Aeneid* varying in length from 1 to 27 lines; 23 from the *Eclogues* varying in length from 1 to 4 lines, and 14 from the *Georgics* from 1 to 67 lines in length. Of the comparatively few quotations which John could have derived from the common mediaeval text books, the majority are from Vergil; yet the general accuracy and number of the quotations conclusively suggests familiarity with the Poet. See Migne, pp. 619-22, 768, 408, 393, 647 et passim.

B

The *Pharsalia* is quoted directly 38 times, the quotations varying in length from 1 to 20 lines and generally characterized by accuracy. See Migne, pp. 441, 496, 596, 407, 418, 811, 854 et passim. Lucan is described as "*Noster Lucanus*."

C

Statius is quoted about ten times, quotations varying in length from 1 to 4 lines. They are all from the *Thebais* and only one or two of them can be found in the grammars. They are quite accurate though some of them are evidently quotations from memory. See Migne, pp. 410, 515, 443 et passim.

D

There are over 37 direct quotations from Ovid, divided as follows: - Seven from the *Fasti*, 9 from the *Metamorphoses*, 5 from the *Amores*, 4 from the *Ars Amatoria*, 3 from the *Remedia Amoris*, 5 from the *Ex-Ponto*, 2 from *Tristia* and 2 from the *Heroides*. Only one or two of these can be traced back to the general mediaeval works. The quotations from all the works except the first two are short - seldom more than two lines in length - seem to be taken from memory largely but those from the first two books are very accurate. See Migne, pp. 256, 296, 408, 411, 702, et passim.

E

From the Epistles there are 32 quotations of 70 lines in all; from the Ars Poetica 26 of 60 lines in all and from the Satires 15 direct quotations amounting to 25 lines. The question of John's knowledge of the Odes is discussed by Schaarschmidt and Manitius. Schaarschmidt, p.88. Manitius, p. 93. See Migne, pp. 175, 295, 387, 405, 656, 727, 762 et passim.

F

Juvenal is quoted 62 times amounting in all to 156 lines. These quotations vary in length from 1 to 12 lines, are distributed among the first 14 Satires and are all extremely accurate.

From Persius there are 25 quotations varying in length from 1 to 7 lines. Not only are John's quotations from this writer more accurate than those of other mediaeval writers, but John is the first writer of the Middle Ages to quote the sixth Satire. Manitius in the Philologus, Vol. 47, p. 718.

The Codex Pithoeanus of the 9th Century which was the source of many of the later Mss. contained both of these writers and this is probably the source of John's confusion. Friedlander: Juvenal. Introd. p. 85 .

G

Though the story of the Ephesian matron might be found in separate manuscripts, yet John's 8 other direct quotations, varying in length from 1 - 8 lines and generally very accurate, which could not, all of them, be found in other sources show that he must have had access to the Satires themselves. Furthermore the title "Noster Arbiter" seems to imply a very intimate acquaintance. John's references to the satires are found in Migne, pp. 488, 491, 673, 753 et passim to the Cena Trimalchionis in Migne pp. 521, 736, 69 et passim. See Collignon, *Pétrone au Moyen Age*, pp. 11-12, Paris, 1893.

H

These quotations are taken from all parts of the Epigrammata; only one is evidently a memory quotation, the others varying in length from 2 to 8 lines are almost perfectly accurate. See Migne, pp. 665, 825, 822 et passim.

I

There are thirteen direct quotations from the *Eunuchus* covering over 80 lines of the original. There are three quotations amounting to 4 lines from the *Andria* outside of the numerous stories which he takes from this source. The quotation from the *Adelphi* is three lines in length. Terence is another writer who receives the appellation "Noster." Schaarschmidt, p. 101. See Migne, pp. 175, 405 et passim.

J

The quotation from Catullus is taken from Martianus Capella III, 229. Cato, Varro and Plautus are disposed of by Schaarschmidt, pp. 86, 101-102. The pseudo-Plautine play *Querolus* written about the 4th Century A.D. is the source for these characters.

K

The different works of Cicero are used by John as follows: *Epistulae*, Migne, pp. 61, 176, 199, 577 et passim.
De Amicitia: Migne, pp. 309, 481-'88 et passim.
Ad Herenium, Migne, pp. 618, 684-'5 et passim.
De Inventione Rhetorica - passim per *Metalogicum*.
De Officiis, Migne, pp. 857, 715, 599 et passim.
Tusculani Disputationes, Migne, pp. 871, 874, 972-'8, 761, *Entheticus*, l. 1219-1232 et passim.
Nova Academica, Migne, pp. 638, 640, 657, 388 et passim.
De Senectute, Migne, p. 402.
De Fato, *Entheticus*, l. 1221-1224.
De Natura Deorum, Migne, p. 449.
Paradoxa Stoicorum, Migne, pp. 546.
De Oratore, Migne, pp. 835-848 et passim.

L.

Quintilian is quoted in Migne, pp. 313, 608, 654, 762-'4 and passim per *Metalogicum*.

M.

Seneca is quoted in Migne, pp. 764, 749, 660, 852, 865, 925 et passim.

N

Suetonius is quoted in Migne, pp. 184, 545, 509-'10, 537, 506, 789-'90 et passim.

Sallust in Migne, pp. 482, 498, 595, 500, 758 et passim.

Livy. in Migne, pp. 495, 542, 788.

Tacitus in Migne, p. 788.

Quintus Curtius in Migne, p. 788.

Valerius Maximus in Migne, pp. 771-775, 719-745 et passim.

Julius Frontinus in Migne, pp. 556-'8, 595-'9, 604-'8 et passim.

Justinus in Migne, pp. 570-'2, 723-'7, 610 et passim.

Julius Florus in Migne, p. 495.

Renatus Vegetius in Migne, pp. 131, 592-'9, 618 et passim.

O

Pliny the Elder is quoted in Migne, pp. 733, 576, 604.

P

Aulus Gellius is quoted in Migne, pp. 455, 641, 525, 572, 912 et passim.

Q

Publilius Syrus is quoted in Migne, pp. 70-72, 1.12-36.

Serenus Sammonicus is quoted in Migne, p. 733. See Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft, Vol. VIII, Part 2, pp. 515-516.

Solinus is quoted in Migne, p. 611. See Philologus, Vol. 47, pp. 563-'4.

R

See Schaarschmidt, pp. 95, 101. Also Philologus, Vol. 48, p. 191.

Eutropius is quoted in Migne, pp. 799, 791 et passim. The quotation on p. 791, mentioned by Schaarschmidt on p. 90 is taken from Orosius VII, 14.

S

Pliny is quoted in Migne, p. 529 et passim. This quotation from Caecilius Balbus occurs on p. 506. See Reifferscheid: "Zwei Litteraturhistorische Phantasmata" in the Philologie for 1861, pp. 12-26.

Flavianus is mentioned in Migne, pp. 460, 755, 761 and 758. See Schaarschmidt, pp. 103-108. Also Manitius

in the *Philologus*, Vol. 47, pp. 566-'7.

T

The discussion of the knowledge of Greek at this time is taken up by Schaarschmidt, pp. 108-124; Poole, pp. 124-130; Clerval, p. 232. John's relations with John the Saracen are contained in two letters found in Migne, pp. 143-'4, 161-'3. A discussion of John's letter of Plutarch is contained in Langhorne's "Lives of Plutarch" in the introduction, and in Schaarschmidt, pp. 123-'4.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

SOURCES

- Ambrosius: Opera Omnia, Patrologiae, Vol. 14-17¹
- Appolinarius: Epistolae et Carminae - ed. Mohr, P.
Leipsic, 1895.
- Apuleius: Opera Omnia - ed. Hildebrand, G. F.,
Leipsic, 1842.
- Augustine: De Civitate Dei - ed. Dombart, B.,
Leipsic, 1877.
- Augustine: Opera Omnia, Patrologiae, Vol. 32-47.¹
- Aulus Gellius: Noctes Atticae - ed. Hertz, M.
Berlin, 1883-'85
- Avianus: Fables - ed. Ellis, R. Oxford, 1887.
- Avienus: Aulularia - ed. Breysig, A. Leipsic, 1882.
- Beda: Opera Omnia, Patrologiae, Vol. 90-94.¹
- Boethius: Consolationis Philosophiae - ed. Peiper, R.
Leipsic, 1871.
- Boethius: De Institutione - ed. Friedlein, G.
Leipsic, 1867.
- Boethius: Commentarii - ed. Meiser, C.
Leipsic, 1877-'80.
- Boethius: Opera Omnia, Patrologiae, Vol. 63, 64.¹
- Cassiodorus: Opera Omnia, patrologiae, Vol. 69-70.
- Catullus: Liber - ed. Baehrens, A.
Leipsic, 1893.
- Cicero: Opera Omnia - ed. Orellius et Baiterus.
Turici, 1845-'61.

- Du Cange: *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*.
Niort, 1883-'87
- Eutropius: *Breviarium* - ed. Hazzard, J. C.
New York, 1898.
- Florus: *Epitomae* - ed. Halm, C.
Leipsic, 1879.
- Forcellini: *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*.
Prague, 1858-'75.
- Frontinus: *Strategemata* - ed. Dederich, A.
Leipsic, 1855.
- Grammatici Latini - ed. Keil, G.T.
Leipsic, 1855-'80.
- Horace: *Opera Omnia* - ed. Wickham, E. C.
Oxford, 1896.
- Isidor: *Opera Omnia, Patrologiae*, Vol. 81-84.¹
- Jerome St.: *Opera Omnia, Patrologiae*, Vol. 23-30.¹
- John of Salisbury: *Opera Omnia Patrologiae*, Vol. 199.
- Juvenal: *Satires* - ed. Friedlander, L.
Peipsic, 1895.
- Justin: *Epitoma* - ed. Ieep, J.
Leipsic, 1876.
- Lactantius: *Opera Omnia, Patrologiae*, Vol. 6-7.¹
- Livy: *Ab Urbe Condita* - ed. Weissenborn, W.
Berlin, 1873-'96.
- Lucan: *Pharsalia* - ed. Francken, C. M.
Leyden, 1896-'97.
- Macrobius: *Saturnalia* - ed. Eyssenhardt, F.
Leipsic, 1893.
- Martial: *Epigrammaton* - ed. Friedlander, L.
Leipsic, 1886.

- Martianus Capella: ----- ed. Eyssenhardt, F.
Leipsic, 1866.
- Nonius Marcellus: *Compendiosa Doctrina* - ed. Mueller, L.
Leipsic, 1888.
- Orosius: *Histories* - ed. Zangemeister, C.
Leipsic, 1889.
- Ovid: *Opera Omnia* - ed. Ewald, R.
Leipsic, 1889-'97.
- Persius: *Satires* - ed. Jahn, O.
Leipsic, 1843.
- Petronius: *Satires* - ed. Buecheler, F.
Berlin, 1882.
- Petronius: *Cena Trimalchionis* - ed. Waters, W. E.
Boston, 1902.
- Pliny: *Natural Histories* - ed. Jahn, L.
Leipsic, 1854-'60
- Pliny: *Letters and Panegyric* - ed. Mueller, C. F. W.
Leipsic, 1903.
- Plutarch: *Lives* - ed. Langhorne J. & W.
London, 1828.
- Plutarch: *Morales* - ed. Goodwin, W. W.
Boston, 1871.
- Quintilian: *Declamationes* - ed. Ritter, C.
Leipsic, 1884.
- Quintilian: *Institutiones Oratoriae* - ed. Bonnel, E.
Leipsic, 1882-'89.
- Rabanus Maurus: *Opera Omnia, Patrologiae*, Vol. 107-112.¹

1. The *Patrologiae* of more than 200 volumes was edited by J. P. Migne at Paris, 1844-'64.



- Sallust: Catiline and Jugurtha - ed. Andrews, E. A.
Boston, 1856.
- Seneca: Opera Omnia - ed. Haase, F.
Leipzig, 1898-1902
- Servius: Commentarium in Virgilio - ed. Thilo, G.
Leipzig, 1864.
- Solinus: Colletanea Rerum Memorabilium - ed. Mommsen, T.
Berlin, 1895.
- Statius: Thebais - ed. Kohlman, P.
Leipzig, 1876-'84.
- Suetonius: Caesars - ed. Reifferscheid, A.,
Leipzig, 1860.
- Terence: Comedies - ed. Parry, S.
London, 1857.
- Valerius Maximus: Facta et Dicta, Memorabilia -
ed. Kempf, C. Leipzig, 1888.
- Vegetius: De Rei Militaris Epitoma - ed. Iang, C.
Second ed.
- Virgil: Opera Omnia - ed. Ribbeck, O.
Leipzig, 1859-'68.

SECONDARY WORKS

- Clerval, A.: Les Ecoles de Chartres au Moyen Age.
Paris, 1895.
- Comparetti, D.: Vergil in the Middle Ages.
London, 1895.
- Haureau, B.: Histoire de la Philosophie Scholastique.
Paris, 1850.
- Histoire Littéraire de France, Vol. 14.
St. Maur, 1865-1906.
- Jourdain, C.: Excursions Historiques et Philosophiques.
Paris, 1888.
- Maitre, L.: Les Ecoles Episcopales et Monastiques de
l'Occident. Paris, 1866.
- Manitius, M.: Beitrage zur Geschichte Romischer Dichter
und Prosaiker im Mittelalter, Philologus,
Leipsic Vol. 47-'64 passim.
- Müller, I.P.: Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthums-
Wissenschaft. Munich, 1890-'96.
- Norden, E.: Die Antike Kunstprosa.
Leipsic, 1898.
- Poole, R.L.: Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval
Thought. London, 1884.
- Reifferscheid, A.: Zwei Litterarhistorische Phantasmata
in the Philologie, Berlin, 1861.
- Sandys, J.E.: A History of Classical Scholarship.
Cambridge, 1906.
- Sellar, W.Y.: Roman Poets of the Republic.
Oxford, 1892.
- Taylor, H.O.: The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages.
New York, 1906.
- Teuffel and Schwabe: A History of Latin Literature.
London, 1891.
- Schaa rschmidt, : Johannes Saresberienſis

Approved George C. Kelley
Asst. Prof. European History

Recommended for honors {
M. S. Slaughter
Alfred L. P. Dennis
G. C. Wicke.

89085980985



b89085980985a

Date Loaned

6 No'58'

9 No'58'

14 No'58'

15 FE'62

16 FE'62

Demco 292-5